

REMARKS

Applicants have carefully considered the May 18, 2005 Office Action, and the amendments above together with the comments that follow are presented in a bona fide effort to address all issues raised in that Action and thereby place this case in condition for allowance. Claims 1, 4, 6, 8, 9 and 11-25 were pending in this application. Claims 17-25 have been withdrawn from consideration pursuant to the provisions of 37 C.F.R. § 1.142(b). In response to the Office Action dated May 18, 2005, claims 1, 4, 11 and 14-16 have been canceled and claims 6, 8, 9, 12 and 13 have been amended. New claims 26-28 have been added. Care has been exercised to avoid the introduction of new matter. Adequate descriptive support for the present Amendment should be apparent throughout the originally filed disclosure as, for example, the depicted embodiments and related discussion thereof in the written description of the specification. Applicants submit that the present Amendment does not generate any new matter issue. Entry of the present Amendment is respectfully solicited. It is believed that this response places this case in condition for allowance. Hence, prompt favorable reconsideration of this case is solicited.

The Examiner objected to claims 1 and 16. The Examiner asserted that the claims incorrectly recite that "the connection portion is selectively blown by a laser beam." In referencing the present specification, the Examiner asserted that the fuse, not the connection portion, is selectively blown by a laser beam. Claims 1 and 16 have been canceled and, therefore, the objection is moot.

Claims 4, 6 and 8 were rejected under the second paragraph 35 U.S.C. § 112 since these claims depended from previously canceled claims. Claim 4 has been canceled and, therefore, the

rejection is moot with respect to this claim. Moreover, the dependencies of claims 6 and 8 have been amended to depend from newly added independent claims 27 and 28, respectively. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that the imposed rejection of claims 6 and 8 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph is not legally viable and hence, Applicants solicit withdrawal thereof.

Claims 1 and 12 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) for lack of novelty as evidenced by Stamper et al (U.S. Pat. No. 6,111,301, hereinafter "Stamper"). In the statement of the rejection, the Examiner referred to Fig. 2 of Stamper, asserting the disclosure of a semiconductor device corresponding to that defined in independent claim 1 and dependent claim 12. Applicants respectfully traverse.

Claim 1 has been canceled and, therefore, the rejection is moot with respect to this claim. Moreover, dependent claim 12 has been amended to depend from newly added claim 26. New claim 26 includes the limitations of originally filed claim 1 and dependent claim 4, which was not rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b). Accordingly, the rejection of claim 12 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) is moot.

Claims 1 and 13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) for lack of novelty as evidenced by Lee et al (U.S. Pat. No. 6,175,145, hereinafter "Lee"). In the statement of the rejection, the Examiner referred to Figs. 5A-5F of Lee, asserting the disclosure of a semiconductor device corresponding to that defined in independent claim 1 and dependent claim 13. Applicants respectfully traverse.

Claim 1 has been canceled and, therefore, the rejection is moot with respect to this claim. Moreover, dependent claim 13 has been amended to depend from newly added claim 26. New claim 26 includes the limitations of originally filed claim 1 and dependent claim 4, which was

not rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b). Accordingly, the rejection of claim 13 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) is moot.

Claims 11 and 16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) for lack of novelty as evidenced by Jeng et al (U.S. Pat. No. 6,753,210, hereinafter "Jeng"). In the statement of the rejection, the Examiner referred to Figs. 12-13 of Jeng, asserting the disclosure of a semiconductor device corresponding to that defined in independent claim 16 and dependent claim 11. Applicants respectfully traverse.

Claims 11 and 16 have been canceled and, therefore, the rejection is moot with respect to these claims.

Claim 9 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) for obviousness predicated upon Stamper in view of Jeng. Claim 9 was also rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) for obviousness predicated upon Lee in view of Jeng. Applicants respectfully traverse both rejections.

Dependent claim 9 has been amended to depend from newly added claim 26. New claim 26 includes the limitations of originally filed claim 1 and dependent claim 4, which was not rejected over prior art. Accordingly, the rejections of claim 9 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) are moot.

It is believed that pending claims 6, 8, 9, 12, 13, 26, 27 and 28 are now in condition for allowance. Applicants therefore respectfully request an early and favorable reconsideration and allowance of this application. If there are any outstanding issues which might be resolved by an interview or an Examiner's amendment, the Examiner is invited to call Applicants' representative at the telephone number shown below.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper,

Application No.: 10/649,737

including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 500417 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,

McDERMOTT WILL & EMERY LLP



Brian K. Seidleck
Registration No. 51,321

600 13th Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20005-3096
Phone: 202.756.8000 BKS:idw
Facsimile: 202.756.8087
Date: August 18, 2005

**Please recognize our Customer No. 20277
as our correspondence address.**